



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

BCL

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/370,663 08/06/99 ABELOW

D 03058/004005

LM01/0706

DAVID L FEIGENBAUM ESQ
FISH & RICHARDSON PC
225 FRANKLIN STREET
BOSTON MA 02110-2804

EXAMINER

DIXON, T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2761

10

DATE MAILED:

07/06/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/370,663

Applicant(s)

ABELOW, DANIEL H.

Examiner

Thomas A. Dixon

Art Unit

2761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 48-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 64-70 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 48-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 20 March 2000 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☐ received.
2. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____.
3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 14) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 15) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 16) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 17) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 18) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 19) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-47 have been cancelled. New claims numbered 1-23 have been added and renumbered 48-70.
2. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 48-63 in Paper No. 9 is acknowledged.
3. Claims 64-70 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Claims 64-70 have not explicitly been cancelled, applicant is requested to do so in response to this action.

Priority

4. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must contain a specific reference to the prior application(s) in the first sentence of the specification (37 CFR 1.78). In this case:

_____ "This is a continuation of United States Patent Application No. 08/934,457, filed 09/19/1997, now Patent Number 5,999,908 which is a continuation of 08/243,638, filed 5/16/1994, now abandoned, which is a CIP of 07/926,333, filed 8/6/1992 now abandoned. "

Drawings

5. Formal Drawings in the case are assumed to have been submitted with the substitute specification, these drawings are acceptable to the Draftsperson and the Examiner and substituted into the case.

Specification

6. The substitute specification is acceptable.

Claim Objections

7. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 1-23 been renumbered 48-70.

8. Claim 52 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 48, line 4 states "a user interface which is part of each of the two-way units..." while claim 52, line 1, states "the user interface comprises a functional user interface which is separate from the unit of the commodity." The user interface cannot be both part of the unit and not part of the unit.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164

USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 48-63 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-47 of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,908. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the patent and the present application claim a user interface as part of a commodity that provides a medium for two-way interaction and a software that manages the interactions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear how the telephone keypad of line 4, is part of the television of claim 57 from which it depends.

11. Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: the relationship between the user interface which is part of

each of the units of the commodity, in this claim a television, and a telephone keypad, which is obviously part of a telephone and not a part of a television..

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Eisen et al (4,964,077) is cited as a system which automatically adjusts interactive help based upon a user's skill level, but does not disclose the invention as claimed.

Ubois, Jeff; "On-line Problem Solving" MacWeek, v7,n24p 16(2), June 1993, submitted by applicant, discloses on-line user assistance via phone and internet, but does not disclose the claimed invention.

WO 94/03865 Abelow is the closest foreign prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas A. Dixon whose telephone number is (703) 305-4645. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7 - 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Todd Voeltz can be reached on (703) 305-9714. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-9051 for regular communications and (703) 305-9051 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9714.

TAD
June 27, 2000


EMANUEL TODD VOELTZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700